November 10, 2005

Report on the Monroe County *Deteriorated Paint Pilot Project*

1. Abstract

This report describes the findings of the **Monroe County Deteriorated Paint Pilot Project**. The project was performed in the spring and summer of 2005 at the request of Monroe County Executive Maggie Brooks. The Monroe County Department of Public Health and the Monroe County Department of Human Services (DHS) performed the project jointly.

The purpose of this pilot project was to study the feasibility of developing a childhood lead poisoning primary prevention strategy that involved assessing residential properties for deteriorated paint that are rented to Monroe County families receiving temporary assistance benefits. The pilot project was designed to assess the condition of the painted surfaces in a total of 30 randomly selected homes within 6 zip codes in the City of Rochester that housed Monroe County public assistance clients

All 30 units (100%) assessed for this pilot project had deteriorated paint. Eighty-three percent (83%) of these units were rated to be in excellent structural condition and 60% were rated to have a low overall amount of deteriorated paint. The results of each of the 30 assessments, along with a cover letter explaining the findings were provided to the property owners, tenants and the DHS. In addition, the property owner was provided with a schedule of Free *Lead Safe Work Practices* training sponsored by Monroe County. Owners were encouraged to attend and utilize lead safe work practices when disturbing all pre-1978 paint.

Property owners were also encouraged to apply for Monroe County's $3,500 U. S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Lead Hazard Control grant. The owners of a total of 9 (30%) of the 30 units applied for the HUD grant. All 9 units were awarded a HUD grant and have completed lead hazard reduction work including clearance testing.

The report concludes that Monroe County should incorporate an assessment of risk for lead poisoning into its Quality Housing Initiative (QHI), a program designed to assure the safety of housing that is rented to public assistance clients. The report recommends that Monroe County, the City of Rochester and their partners should work together to implement the changes suggested.

2. Table of Contents

3. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the findings of the **Monroe County Deteriorated Paint Pilot Project**. The project was performed in the spring and summer of 2005 at the request of Monroe County Executive Maggie Brooks. The Monroe County Department of Public Health and the Monroe County Department of Human Services performed the project jointly.

The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have set a goal for the elimination of childhood lead poisoning in the United States by the year 2010. A necessary step to reach the goal is the development of strategies to find properties that contain significant lead hazards *before* the children residing in these properties become lead poisoned.

It has been reported that a very high proportion of children with elevated blood lead levels reside in property units with families that receive public assistance benefits. In theory, the targeting of lead hazard assessments to properties housing families receiving public assistance benefits would be very efficient.

To test this hypothesis, in June 2004 Monroe County Executive Maggie Brooks made a commitment that Monroe County government would conduct a pilot project. The purpose of this pilot project was to study the feasibility of developing a childhood lead poisoning primary prevention strategy that involved assessing residential properties for deteriorated paint that are rented to Monroe County families receiving temporary assistance benefits.

The pilot project was designed to assess the condition of the painted surfaces in a total of 30 randomly selected homes within 6 zip codes in the City of Rochester that housed Monroe County public assistance clients. The results of this pilot project could help inform future housing, health and safety programs in the City of Rochester and in Monroe County.

Monroe County is committed to the goal of assuring that properties that are rented to DHS Temporary Assistance clients are safe. To that end, in partnership with the City of Rochester, Monroe County DHS developed the Quality Housing Initiative (QHI). In the QHI, City of Rochester Code Enforcement Officers inspect properties for health and safety code violations. If the properties undergo and pass QHI inspections, property owners are eligible to receive direct rent payments from DHS.

In late 2005, it is very likely that the City of Rochester will adopt a property code amendment that will require that rental properties be periodically assessed for deteriorated paint. Monroe County is interested in incorporating an assessment for deteriorated paint into the QHI. Monroe County officials have been studying how the code change could affect the QHI. This pilot project will help Monroe County officials in their efforts to assure that the QHI continues to protect the safety of Temporary

Assistance beneficiaries without causing unnecessary problems for property owners under the new City code amendment.

This **Deteriorated Paint Pilot Project Report** contains information about the methods used, the results of the assessments of the general conditions of the properties and the results of the inspections for deteriorated paint. This report also contains information about the status of these property units in the DHS QHI Program and information about blood lead screening of children residing in the units. The report summarizes the level of interest of the property owners in receiving the reports of deteriorated paint in receiving Lead Safe Work Practices training, and in receiving a grant to offset the costs of lead hazard reduction. This report contains copies of all the letters sent to property owners and tenants. Additional information regarding pilot units that volunteered for the Monroe County HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant is included.

This information includes the total number of property owners awarded a HUD grant, the amount of time required for each lead hazard reduction project, the actual costs for lead hazard reduction, the proportion of the cost reimbursed by the HUD grant and the methods/types of lead hazard reduction performed.

4. METHODS

4.1 OVERVIEW OF METHODS

Planning for the pilot project began in February 2005 and the project was fully implemented in March 2005. A total of 113 property owners were canvassed for voluntary participation in this project. All units were located in the following 6 City of Rochester zip codes: 14605, 14608, 14609, 14611, 14619, and 14621. Children in these six zip codes were reported to have had the highest rates of lead poisoning according to the New York State Department of Health. (These findings were reported in *Promoting Lead Free Children in New York State:* A *Report of Lead Exposure Status among New York Children, 2000-2001).*

Units were drawn from a database maintained by DHS that contains the names and addresses of active participants in the DHS Temporary Assistance Program that had children less than 6 years of age and were receiving a shelter allowance. One hundred and thirteen (113) such units were canvassed for participation in the pilot project. Environmental Protection Agency certified Lead Risk Assessors in the Department of Public Health's Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program conducted the assessments.

The procedures and methodologies used for this pilot are derived from the following documents:

- Title 24 CFR Part 35 Housing and Urban Development (federal Code of Rules and Regulations) Lead –Based Paint Poisoning Prevention in Certain Residential Structures,
- 40 CFR 745 Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention In Certain Residential Structures.
- HUD Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead Based Paint Hazards in Housing (1992).

Note: Title 24 Part 35 and 40 CFR 745 will be referenced in the descriptions of the methodologies related to sampling standards, locations and data interpretation because the 1992 version of the HUD guidelines do not always reflect current lead standards and practices.

4.2 SELECTION OF TARGETED UNITS

The Monroe County Department of Human Services maintains a database that includes clients names, client address and property owner names for beneficiaries in the Temporary Assistance Program. Staff in DHS queried the database for clients approved for Temporary Assistance who received a shelter allowance, who had children under the age of six years and who had a documented move within 30 days of the report generation. The DHS Emergency Housing Coordinator selected cases

in each of the targeted zip codes for this report then matched property owner information to each case.

This electronic report was provided to the MCDPH Lead Program's Environmental Supervisor. This data was then transferred into an *Access* Pilot Project Database that was used to track all assessment information. DHS provided a new list of cases to the Lead Program on a monthly basis until a total of 30 units were successfully evaluated. The DHS electronic report included the following information:

- General Property Information: street number, street name and zip code. (Units constructed after 1978 were excluded.)
- Tenant Information: head of household, names of children ≤ 6 years of age along with dates of birth, length of time the tenant resided at the targeted unit.
- Property Owner Information: owner name and mailing address.
- Quality Housing Inspection Information: A photocopy of the Quality Housing Inspection report (if conducted).

4.3 ACCESS TO TARGETED UNITS

In an effort to assist with entrance to the property, the MCDPH notified all property owners, via a "Homeowner Contact Letter", that their unit had been randomly selected for this voluntary deteriorated paint project. The property owner was requested to contact the MCDPH within 5 business days to schedule the evaluation. After a period of 10 business days, if access was not successful, a second contact letter was mailed to the property owner encouraging their voluntary participation. Samples of the letters are included in Attachment 9.3 of this report

4.4 ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL

The following is taken directly from the *Deteriorated Paint Pilot Project Plan*:

1. An EPA certified Risk Assessor from the MCDPH would conduct a visual assessment of all painted surfaces in accordance with procedures established by HUD in order to identify any deteriorated paint. (*HUD Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-based Paint Hazards in Housing, June 1995: Chapter 5 Lead Based Paint Risk Assessments*)

2. The Risk Assessor will use a "Visual Assessment Form" to document the interior and exterior surfaces found to have deteriorated paint as defined in 24 CFR 745:
   Deteriorated paint means any interior or exterior paint or other coating that is peeling, chipping, chalking or cracking, or any paint or coating located on an interior or exterior surface or fixture that is otherwise damaged or separated from the substrate.
   For the purposes of this pilot, all paint on the interior and exterior of any residential unit on which the original construction was completed prior to January 1, 1978 shall be presumed to be lead-based.

3. If NO deteriorated paint is identified, this will be documented on the visual assessment form and a "Lead Hazard Screen Risk Assessment" will be conducted as follows:

Lead Hazard Screen Risk Assessment procedure with exclusion of testing paint in "poor" condition (40 CFR 745.227):

(1) Only a person certified by EPA as a risk assessor shall conduct a lead hazard screen.

(2) If conducted, a lead hazard screen shall be conducted as follows:

(i) Background information regarding the physical characteristics of the residential dwelling and occupant use patterns that may cause lead-based paint exposure to one or more children age 6 years and under shall be collected.

(ii) A visual inspection of the residential dwelling or child-occupied facility shall be conducted to:

(3) Locate at least two dust-sampling locations.

(i) In residential dwellings, two composite dust samples shall be collected, one from the floors and the other from the windows, in rooms, hallways or stairwells where one or more children, age 6 and under, are most likely to come in contact with dust.

(ii) In multi-family dwellings the risk assessor shall also collect composite dust samples from common areas where one or more children, age 6 and under, are most likely to come into contact with dust.

- The MCDPH will employ single surface dust hazard Identification because no National Lead Laboratory Accreditation Program (NLLAP) certification method for composite dust wipe analysis currently exists.
- Two (2) Single surface dust samples shall be collected from 2 rooms within the residential dwellings and one (1) sample shall be collected from 1 common area in multi-family dwellings. Samples shall be taken on windowsills and floors.
- Turn around time for lab analysis will be 24 hours.

(4). Dust samples shall be collected and analyzed in the following manner:

(i) All dust samples shall be taken using documented methodologies that incorporate adequate quality control procedures.

(ii) All collected dust samples shall be analyzed according to 40CFR 745.227 to determine if they contain detectable levels of lead that can be quantified numerically.

(5) The results of both the visual assessment and the lead dust hazard identification results will be documented on the "Lead Hazard Screening Form".

Lead Hazard Screen Evaluation Dust Standards:

Surface	Negative Screen (Arithmetic mean)	Positive Screen (Arithmetic mean)
Floor	$< 25\ \mu g/ft^2$	$\geq 25\ \mu g/ft^2$
Window Sill	$< 125\ \mu g/ft^2$	$\geq 125\ \mu g/ft^2$

5. RESULTS

5.1 GENERAL FINDINGS FROM THE PILOT ASSESSMENTS

The DHS provided the MCDPH with property, owner and tenant information for a total of 113 units within 6 zip codes located in the City of Rochester. A total of 49 (43.4%) of these property owners made contact with the Health Department after receiving canvass letters. (See Attachment 9.6 of this report for the reasons why 19 owners chose not to participate).

A total of 30 units were assessed for the pilot project after the property owner voluntarily agreed to participate. Environmental Protection Agency certified Lead Risk Assessors in the Department of Public Health Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program conducted these assessments. The Risk Assessors completed a visual assessment for deteriorated paint. All 30 units (100%) assessed had deteriorated paint therefore it was not necessary to conduct a lead hazard screen (no lead dust wipe sampling was necessary).

After the completion of the assessment, the MCDPH provided written results of the assessment to the property owner, tenant and DHS. All parties (owner, tenant and DHS) received a "Visual Assessment Report" for all surfaces noted to have deteriorated paint at the time of the assessment along with a cover letter explaining the assessment. The cover letter noted that deteriorated paint was identified (for the purposes of this project, pre-1978 paint was presumed to be lead-based).

As noted in section 5.9 of this report, several surfaces that were noted to be visually deteriorated did not actually contain lead paint. A full risk assessment or an assessment similar to the one utilized by the Monroe County HUD grant can only determine the presence of lead paint hazards.

The property owner was advised of the availability of grant funds under the Department of Public Health's *HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant* and was encouraged to apply. Along with a cover letter and Visual Assessment Report the following information was provided to the property owner: Monroe County's Free *Lead Safe Work Practices* Training Schedule, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) *Renovation and Remodeling* booklet, EPA *Protect your Family From Lead in the Home* booklet and a Monroe County *HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant* application package.

Each tenant was sent additional lead poisoning prevention information. The tenant letter stated that pre-1978 paint is presumed to be lead-based and that the results of the evaluation conducted on the specific date may not reflect current conditions in the home. They were advised that all children should be kept away from all deteriorated paint that currently exists or occurs due to normal weathering or wear and tear. Tenants were advised to have all children $\leq$ 6 years of age screened for lead by their primary care provider. Tenants were encouraged to contact the Environmental

Supervisor named in the letter to address any concerns that they may have regarding this assessment. None of these 30 tenants made contact with the Lead Program regarding any concerns following the pilot assessments. Each tenant was also provided with general lead screening information as well as the EPA *Protect your Family From Lead in the Home* booklet.

This pilot assessment report includes individual "Visual Assessment Reports" for each unit assessed. Each "Visual Assessment Report" lists surfaces where deteriorated paint was identified at the time of the assessment by room/location and surface(s). In some cases, the Risk Assessor made surface comments for clarification. As noted on each report, all areas of the unit may not have been assessed. Each unit assessed in the pilot is identified using only the Property ID #. Complete reports with all identifying property information including address and Risk Assessor were provided to the DHS upon completion of each assessment. Property owners voluntarily participated with the understanding that only DHS and MCDPH would be provided with specific property information.

Every unit was assessed on an individual basis yet in general it is believed that the units assessed for this project represent the condition of "typical" pre -1978 houses in the City of Rochester. The types of surfaces, which were deteriorated, were typically surfaces exposed to natural weathering such as exterior window components, doors, sidings, and trim. All painted surfaces exposed to rain, snow, sun, normal wear and tear and abuse are very likely to have some state of deterioration and require routine maintenance.

5.2 CONDITION OF UNITS ASSESSED

The Individual Assessment Reports for all 30 units are included in Attachment 9.4 at the end of this report.

Number of Units Canvassed by Zip Code

Zip Code	# Units Canvassed
14605	17
14608	21
14609	20
14611	20
14619	17
14621	18
Total	**113**

Number of Units with Deteriorated Paint by Zip Code

Zip Code	# Units Assessed	# Units with Deteriorated Paint	# Of children ≤ 6 years old (Assessed Units)
14605	4	4	4
14608	6	6	8
14609	6	6	9
14611	3	3	4
14619	5	5	10
14621	6	6	9
Total	**30**	**30**	**44**

Each Risk Assessor rated the overall condition of each unit after the visual assessment. Building maintenance, structural stability and condition of painted substrates were observed to determine overall condition. Over 83% (25 units) of the units assessed are rated to be in excellent or good condition. Very few units, 17 % (5 units), were rated to be in fair or poor overall condition.

Distribution of Units by Overall Property Condition

Condition	# Units	%
Excellent	12	40%
Good	13	43.3%
Fair	4	13.3%
Poor	1	3.3%
Total	30	100 %

5.3 AMOUNT OF DETERIORATED PAINT IDENTIFIED

Each Risk Assessor rated the total amount of deteriorated paint found in each unit as a whole after the visual assessment. A low amount of overall deteriorated paint was found in 60% of the units (18 units). Ten (10) units or 33.3% had a medium amount of deteriorated paint and only 2 units or 6.7% had a high amount of deteriorated paint.

Quantification of Amount Of Deteriorated Paint Identified

Amount of Deteriorated Paint	# Units	%
Low	18	60%
Medium	10	33.3%
High	2	6.7%
Total	30	100 %

5.4 QUALITY HOUSING INSPECTION DATA (Reported by DHS)

General information regarding Quality Housing Inspections were provided by the DHS. Of the 30 units assessed, 14 (47%) were reported to have a QHI inspection that had been performed by the City of Rochester. Currently, assessing for the condition of painted surfaces is not part of this inspection. A total of 16 units (53%) were reported not to have a QHI inspection. Of the 14 units with a reported QHI inspection, 13 units (93%) were reported to have "passed" and 1 unit (7%) was reported to have "failed". Information that was provided regarding these inspections is noted on the individual "Visual Assessment Reports" in the Attachment 9.4 of this report.

5.5 BLOOD LEAD SCREENING DATA

There were a total of 44 children ≤ 6 years of age living in these 30 units. The Monroe County Department of Public Health maintains a database of all lead screening tests performed on children in Monroe County. The lead history of each of the 44 children was reviewed.

As of November 2, 2005 eighty-four percent of these children (84%, 37 children) had a reported blood lead test in the database. The NYSDOH Public Health Law states that all children will have a blood lead test at both 1 and 2 years of age. Because children do not typically have their first blood lead test until 1 year of age presumably, two (2) children were not tested because they were too young. Initially, six (6) children over the age of one year were not tested, however one child was tested subsequent to our outreach intervention. In addition, five children were re-tested between August and October 2005.

All parents were contacted in writing and advised to have all children screened for lead. Thirty-six (36) of the 37 blood lead history records reviewed for these children were found to be in compliance with this law. One child's record was not in compliance with this law as they were only tested once at age 4.

One hundred percent of those children tested (100%, 37 children) had a blood lead level of < 10 μg/dl (a level that the *Centers for Disease Control* does not consider to be elevated).

As part of the lead poisoning intervention, parents were encouraged to have any child who regularly spends time in their home to a have a blood lead test. They were also advised to have each child tested for lead annually until 6 years of age if they continue to live in older homes. Each parent was further advised that all young children should always be supervised and kept away from all painted surfaces that are or become damaged or deteriorated. Written literature on lead poisoning prevention and blood lead screening was mailed to each parent along with the results of the pilot assessment.

SUMMARY OF LEAD SCREENING DATA

Blood Lead Level	# Children		
< 10 μg/dl	37		
≥ 10 μg/dl	0		
Never Screened	7	< 1 Year of age = 2	≥ 1 Year of age = 5
Total	44		

5.6 PROPERTY OWNERS CANVASSED WHO CONTACTED THE MCDPH BUT DECLINED TO PARTICIPATE IN PILOT

A total of 49 (43%) homeowners contacted the MCDPH as a follow-up to receiving a canvass letter. In addition to the 30 pilot units, 19 additional property owners contacted the MCDPH to decline the invitation to voluntarily participate. The reasons for those 19-property owners not wanting to participate were many. Some of the reasons are as follows: fear of enforcement, pending house sale, property well maintained - no need to participate, unable to gain entry, tenants moving and HUD grant money not enough for repairs. Comments of the 19 property owners are included in Attachment 9.5 of this report.

5.7 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE 30 PILOT PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING THEIR INTEREST IN ATTENDING LEAD SAFE WORK PRACTICES (LSWP) TRAINING, ADDRESSING DETERIORATED PAINT AND THE LEAD HAZARD CONTROL HUD GRANT

Most of the property owners were interested in correcting deteriorated paint either on their own or through the HUD grant. A total of 7 property owners, including 2 HUD Grantees, had previously taken the LSWP training. In additional to the 5 HUD grant property owners that were required to complete the LSWP training, one additional owner completed the training. Some of the reasons why property owners were not interested in the HUD grant are as follows: grant conditions and restrictions, minimal repair work needed and EPA requirements for window removal. The property owners' comments are included in Attachment 9.6 of this report.

5.8 ESTIMATED COST TO CONDUCT THE PILOT

The time required and the costs to perform the activities in the pilot were estimated by the project manager.

Activity	Hours	Estimated Cost
1. MCDPH Pilot Plan Development	40	$1500
2. MCDPH Pilot Database (tables/reports/letters)	120	$3900
3. MCDPH & DHS Plan Review/County Approval	30	$1500
4. MCDHS clerical, IT, Management	19	$600
5. MCDPH Pilot Field Assessment/Reporting	60	$1800
6. MCDPH clerical, Management	35	$1000

Total = $10,300

The actual cost to conduct the field portion of this pilot was relatively low ($1,800 to assess all units). Item # 5. MCDPH Pilot Field Assessment & Reporting cost: included the Risk Assessor's hourly rate multiplied by the number of hours to conduct the Visual Assessment, inputting data into pilot database and production of reports. Planning and development of this pilot is estimated to be $8,500 for a total cost of $10,300.

All 30 units were found to have deteriorated paint therefore a lead hazard screen was not conducted. In contrast to a full lead-based paint inspection or a risk assessment, which is required for the HUD grant, the visual assessment used in this pilot is much less complex and requires less time. A full lead-based paint inspection or risk assessment costs approximately $400 - $500.

5.9 MONROE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD) LEAD HAZARD CONTROL GRANT PILOT UNIT PARTICIPATION

Each property owner that voluntarily participated in the pilot was offered the Lead Program's U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Lead Hazard Control grant for reimbursement up to $3,500 per unit. The HUD grant incentive was an additional incentive available to pilot participants. Of the 30 units assessed, the Lead Program received 9 HUD grant applications. All 9 units were accepted into the HUD grant. One (1) additional unit associated with the 30 pilot units was accepted into the HUD grant. This unit was within the same duplex as the pilot unit (Property ID #52) and lead hazard control work was completed.

The overall condition of the 30 properties assessed during the Pilot was rated as follows: 12 excellent, 13 good, 4 fair and 1 poor. The condition of the 9 HUD grant units during the pilot assessment was as follows: 2 excellent, 6 good, and 1 fair. Out of the 5 Pilot units rated as fair or poor only one of the fair units participated in the HUD grant.

The HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant specifies that either a *Risk Assessment* or a *Lead Paint Inspection* is used for lead assessments of all units receiving federal assistance for lead hazard control. The *Monroe County HUD grant Lead Assessment* method utilized for all 9 pilot units was a combination of an *X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Lead Paint Inspection* along with *Lead in soil Hazard Identification*. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) certified Risk Assessors in the Lead Program conducted these lead assessments because only an EPA certified Risk Assessor has the ability to identify lead-based paint hazards. To establish consistency in this project the same Risk Assessor who conducted the *Pilot Visual Assessment* also conducted the *HUD grant Lead Assessments*. The *Lead Paint Inspection* conducted was a detailed visual assessment of all painted surfaces along with a surface-by-surface XRF survey, which determines the concentration of lead in the painted surface, represented in milligrams per square centimeter. Areas of bare soil, which are defined as greater than 9 square feet were also sampled for lead concentration which is represented in parts per million. No lead dust sampling was

conducted during the HUD lead assessment. The Risk Assessor then reviewed the *Lead Paint Inspection* and *Soil Sampling* data and determined whether the identified lead was a lead hazard. (See attachment 9.7 for the Monroe County HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant Evaluation Protocol).

Next the Risk Assessor translated the identified lead hazards into a *Work Plan*, which detailed the location and surfaces where lead hazards were identified. Several of the pre-1978 painted surfaces with visibly deteriorated paint actually did not contain lead and were not lead paint hazards therefore these surfaces were not listed in the *Work Plan*. The *Work Plan* outlined the prescribed lead hazard control options for identified paint or soil lead hazards. (See attachment 9.7 for Monroe County HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant Work Plan Protocol)

HUD Lead Hazard Control Reports for each of the 9 pilot units contains the following information: Location of lead hazards, method and type of lead hazard control, who conducted the lead hazard control work, actual cost for work versus grant reimbursement cost. Various dates such as grant approval date, assessment dates, lead hazard control start date and clearance date are noted for reference. (See Attachment 9.8 for HUD Lead Hazard Control Reports)

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA FOR 9 PILOT UNITS
ACCEPTED INTO HUD LEAD HAZARD CONTROL GRANT

Property ID	Zip Code	HUD Grant Application Approval Date	HUD Grant Assessment Date	Lead Hazard Control Start Date	Lead Hazard Control Clearance Date
25	14609	05/12/05	06/14/05	09/20/05	09/30/05
28	14609	05/18/05	05/23/05	09/20/05	09/30/05
43	14619	04/18/05	04/29/05	05/06/05	05/27/05
52	14621	05/16/05	07/07/05	07/22/05	09/01/05
59	14609	05/12/05	06/14/05	09/21/05	09/30/05
73	14608	06/14/05	08/08/05	09/15/05	09/28/05
106	14619	05/27/05	06/23/05	08/15/05	09/16/05
108	14619	05/27/05	06/23/05	08/15/05	09/15/05
113	14621	05/18/05	05/25/05	08/15/05	09/16/05

(Property ID Units in **Bold** are units within the same duplex (#25 & 59/#106 & 108)

HUD GRANT LEAD HAZARD CONTROL MEASURES

The property owner had the option of utilizing either *Lead Abatement* (permanent control measures intended to last 20 years or more) or *Interim Controls* (control measures intended to last less than 20 years). According to EPA when a lead hazard

is identified in paint, dust or soil and the property owner chooses to use permanent Lead Abatement controls, an *EPA Certified Lead Abatement Firm* must be utilized. Since EPA regulates all lead paint activities in New York State the type of lead assessment (Lead Paint Inspection, Risk Assessment, Lead Dust sampling or Elevated Blood Lead Investigation) will determine who can conduct each lead hazard control option selected by the property owner. If the property owner elected to control all lead hazards with *Interim Controls* they could utilize a worker who successfully completed a 6-hour HUD/EPA approved *Lead Safe Work Practices Class* which complies with 24 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 35.

An *EPA Certified Lead Abatement Firm* was retained for 5 of the 9 pilot units. In the remaining 4 units, a worker trained in *Lead Safe Work Practices* was hired and in some cases the property owner who was trained in Lead Safe Work Practices conducted the lead hazard control work. It should be noted that in all cases regardless of who conducted the control measures, as a condition of the grant each property owner was required to complete the 6-hour Lead Safe Work Practices class. Monroe County offers this class free of charge to other property owners who are being regulated by the MCDPH Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. Property owners who hired *EPA Certified Lead Abatement Contractors* did so because they chose to have some of their windows removed and replaced. Upon reviewing the attached *HUD Lead Hazard Control Reports* it's important to note that although Abatement Contractors were hired for 5 of the 9 units, the abatement contractor conducted both abatement and interim control work. In an effort to keep the cost as low as possible, the abatement contractor assessed the scope of work and negotiated with the property owner as to which surfaces were permanently controlled and which surfaces received interim control measures.

The *HUD Lead Hazard Control Reports* list the rooms and surfaces where lead paint hazards were identified. The methods of lead hazard control as well as the types of lead hazard control are listed next to each surface. The methods of lead hazard control utilized for the pilot units were as follows:

Interim Controls

- Wet scrape deteriorated paint, prime and paint
- Window well enclosures (aluminum coil stock/caulking seams)
- Friction treatments: Vinyl window jamb enclosures or removing small amounts of abraded paint from friction points
- Carpet, vinyl or plywood floor enclosures
- Rubber tread enclosures
- Mulch cover (soil treatment)

Permanent Controls (Abatement)

- Window removal and replacement

TYPE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL WORKERS

Property ID	Zip Code	LEAD HAZARD CONTROL WORK CONDUCTED BY
25	**14609**	**EPA ABATEMENT FIRM**
28	14609	LEAD SAFE WORKER
43	14619	LEAD SAFE WORKER
52	14621	EPA ABATEMENT FIRM
59	**14609**	**EPA ABATEMENT FIRM**
73	14608	LEAD SAFE WORKER
106	**14619**	**EPA ABATEMENT FIRM**
108	**14619**	**EPA ABATEMENT FIRM**
113	14621	LEAD SAFE WORKER

(Property ID Units in **Bold** are units within the same duplex (#25 & 59/#106 & 108)

After lead hazard control was completed each unit had to pass both a visual inspection and lead dust clearance to fulfill the HUD grant conditions. The Risk Assessor verified that all lead paint hazards were controlled prior to conducting lead dust clearance. Lead dust clearance samples were then taken in a minimum of 4 rooms on floors, windowsills and window troughs. Lead dust clearance is conducted a minimum of 1 hour after final cleanup and preferably within 24 hours of cleaning. The purpose of dust clearance is to verify that the work area has been cleaned to meet EPA clearance standards. The dust clearance only verifies the dust levels immediately following lead hazard control work are within EPA standards and does not verify continued lead safety of the unit. It should be noted that lead dust levels in a home re-accumulate quickly from exterior ambient sources of lead, which are unrelated to the presence of lead paint in the home. (Reference: “An exterior and interior leaded dust deposition survey in New York City: Results of a 2 –year study”, Caravanos et al., 2005)

Clearance was obtained on the first attempt for 6 of the 9 units (67%). In 3 of the 9 units (33%) clearance was obtained on the second attempt. When units fail dust clearance they must be re-cleaned by the Lead Safe Worker or Abatement Contractor prior to the next round of dust sampling. As of September 30, 2005, all 9 units passed a final HUD grant visual and lead dust clearance. The cost to conduct one round of lead dust clearance was approximately $100, which only includes the cost of laboratory analysis, not the Risk Assessors’ time. For comparison the fair market value for a full private clearance including a clearance report is about $300 per sampling round. This figure includes the Risk Assessors time, lab fees and report writing. (See attachment 9.7 for Monroe County HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant Clearance Protocol).

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF UNITS WITH LEAD PAINT HAZARDS BY GROUPED COMPONENT

# OF UNITS	% OF UNITS	IDENTIFIED LEAD PAINT HAZARDS BY COMPONENT
4	44	Exterior Siding /Trim
8	89	Exterior Porch Components
9	100	Exterior Window Components (wells/frames/sashes)
3	33	Exterior Doors/Door Trim
6	67	Interior Attic/Basement/Entryway Stairs & treads
6	67	Interior Walls
2	22	Interior Window Components
3	33	Interior Doors/Door Trim
3	33	Bare Soil

Exterior and high impact pre-1978 paint typically contained lead due to the need for durability. One hundred percent of portions of all exterior window components, 89% of exterior porch components and 67% of interior attic/entryway/basement stairs & treads were classified as lead hazards. It's to be expected that surfaces, which receive extreme weathering or high impact wear, are likely to show some signs of deterioration.

NUMBER OF DAYS FROM GRANT APPLICATION TO FINAL CLEARANCE & NUMBER OF DAYS FROM START OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL WORK TO FINAL CLEARANCE

Property ID	Zip Code	Total Number of Days from Grant Application to Final Clearance	Total Number of Days From Lead Hazard Control Start Date to Final Clearance
25	14609	141	10
28	14609	135	10
43	14619	39	21
52	14621	108	41
59	14609	141	9
73	14608	106	13
106	14619	112	32
108	14619	111	31
113	14621	121	32

(Property ID Units in **Bold** are units within the same duplex (#25 & 59/#106 & 108)

The number of days from Grant application approval to Final Clearance ranged from 39 days to 141 days. The number of days from the start of lead hazard control to final clearance ranged from 9 days to 41 days. The length of time for each unit to complete the grant was dependent on many factors. Each owner was requested to provide both the difficulties/delays and successes with the grant process. The

owners' comments are included in the following table and are itemized by unit. Note that units 25 & 59 and 106 & 108 are duplexes therefore comments are combined.

PROPERTY OWNER COMMENTS REGARDING SUCCESSES/DIFFICULTIES WITH HUD LEAD HAZARD CONTROL GRANT

Property ID	Owner Comments
25 & 59	• Owner had some problems finding an EPA Certified Contractor to do the work in a timely fashion. Some of the contractors did not want to work on occupied units, some were too busy and some did not call owner back. The contractor hired already had done other jobs through the HUD Grant and was familiar with the process, while some of the other EPA Certified Contractors did not want to do work through the County HUD Grant. • Owner had trouble in paying the Contractor. Owner had to obtain a home equity loan to pay for the job and then be reimbursed by the HUD Grant after the work was completed and the paper work processed. • The amount of work required was higher in cost than the reimbursement from the HUD Grant. • Owner needed the tenants out of the house when some of the work was being performed. • When window replacement is done it takes a minimum of 2 weeks to obtain the windows after they are ordered.
28	• Owner had some problems finding an EPA Certified Contractor to do the work in a timely fashion. Owner had a contractor lined up yet the contractor never did the work. • When the owner could not get an EPA Certified Contractor by the deadline date he decided to use interim controls for all of the work and he needed to find a Contractor trained in Lead Safe Work Practices. • The unit was occupied and the owner paid to relocate the tenant (relocation cost was reimbursed by grant.)
43	• Owners did not encounter any problems with completing the grant. • Two rounds of dust sampling were required to pass clearance.
52	• There was a delay in starting the grant process because the tenant was uncooperative with the signing the income verification form. • Owner did not have any problems selecting an abatement contractor to replace the windows. The owner did the remaining interim control work. • The contractor was very busy and owners had to wait a couple of weeks for him to start the work. • Two rounds of dust sampling were required to pass clearance.

73	• There were delays in the owner's response time regarding completion of the grant application. • The HUD Grant experience of the owner was generally positive. • Property did not require extensive repair and the repairs made were covered within the dollar limits of HUD grant. • The owner was able to work well with his tenants regarding occupant protection and work access issues.
106 & 108	• Initially owner did not have a problem picking a contractor to the do the work but he could not start the job for a month. After the month was up contractor informed the owner that he did not want the job. Owner selected another contractor to do the work but had to wait a couple of weeks for the job to start due to the contractor's busy schedule. • Contractor had some difficulty getting the tenant out of unit 106. • Unit 108 required two rounds of dust sampling to pass clearance.
113	• Owner had problems finding an EPA Certified Contractor to do the work in a timely fashion. • Owner had hired an EPA contractor who ordered windows. Two months elapsed with no word from contractor to set a start date. • The owner was a Lead Safe Worker and ended up performing all lead hazard controls using interim controls.

COST FOR LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

The true cost to rehab a home for deteriorated lead paint is highly dependent on a multitude of factors. Some factors that have a direct impact on the cost are:

- Type of initial assessment conducted - visual only or lead hazard identification for paint, dust or soil.
- Number of lead paint hazards identified and scope of lead hazard control work.
- Type of lead hazard control methods utilized (Interim or abatement methods)
- Homeowners' ability to conduct lead hazard control methods themselves.
- Requirement to hire EPA Certified Lead Abatement Firm or Lead Safe Worker.
- Size of the house

Other costs that may be incurred by the owner:
- Relocation of tenants and their belonging and pets.
- Fair market value of a full private Risk Assessment is about $450.
- Fair market value of a private Clearance and report is $300

The maximum reimbursement cost for this grant was $3,500 per unit. Knowing the maximum dollar amount for reimbursement is an obvious need for any renovation job yet it's fair to say that the maximum reimbursed rate of $3,500 had a lot to do with the type of work conducted and the receipts rendered for reimbursement. The abatement contractors hired for the pilot units worked with the owners to modify the

scope of lead hazard control in order to come as close as possible to the budget of $3,500.

As a cost saving measure instead of replacing all windows, the abatement contractor replaced some windows and installed jamb and well liners in other windows. Whether Lead Safe Workers or an Abatement firm conducted the work, each property owner was required to submit receipts for labor and materials for work conducted in each unit. The costs, which the owner submitted, were added to the cost of free jamb liners supplied by the Health Department (if supplied), Lead Safe Work Practices Training and laboratory sample fees to obtain the Actual Grant Cost. The cost of the Risk Assessors time and grant administrative costs are not included in the Actual Cost yet this is estimated to be at least $1,500. **The Actual cost for lead hazard control work for the 9 pilot units ranged from $1,447 to $4,895.** The cost for each unit is outlined in the following table:

HUD LEAD HAZARD CONTROL GRANT COSTS

Property ID	Zip Code	ACTUAL COST	REIMBURSED COST
25	14609	$ 4444	$ 3500
28	14609	$ 4115	$ 3500
43	14619	$ 2291	$ 1991
52	14621	$ 4895	$ 3500
59	14609	$ 4630	$ 3500
73	14608	$1447	$1247
106	14619	$ 3702	$ 3500
108	14619	$ 3700	$ 3500
113	14621	$ 4091	$ 3500

(Property ID Units in **Bold** are units within the same duplex (#25 & 59/#106 & 108)

Effective July 1, 2005, the County HUD Lead Hazard Control grant program ceased processing new applications due to capacity limitations. The property owners (21 units) who did not apply for the grant were subsequently sent a 3rd quarter Free *Lead Safe Work Practices* training schedule along with additional information on the City of Rochester's HUD lead grants.

6. DISCUSSION

Property owners that participated in this pilot project were willing to do so as volunteers with the understanding there would be no regulatory enforcement by the Department of Public Health or Department of Human Services. The information contained within this report could only be obtained through the generous cooperation of these property owners. Without owner support, this pilot project could not have been conducted.

The Department of Public Health Risk Assessors who conducted this pilot believe these homes are representative of the types of housing in the City of Rochester that are likely to be rented by clients in the Monroe County DHS Temporary Assistance Program. These Risk Assessors have conducted elevated blood lead investigations in a wide range of homes in all parts of the community and therefore they have a tremendous amount of housing-related experience on which to base their judgement. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the findings in this pilot can be generalized to all pre-1978 properties that are rented to DHS Temporary Assistance beneficiaries.

Based on the findings in this report, it is very likely that a childhood lead poisoning primary prevention program that utilizes participation in public assistance program for targeting residential properties for lead hazard assessment will find a very high rate of lead hazards. This must be taken into account in the design of such a program. For example, if such a program was to be implemented universally and public assistance clients were forbidden to rent such properties, a shortage of community housing for these families could occur. This problem could be partially alleviated by a phased geographic implementation or substantial planning effort in conjunction with affected property owners.

As noted in the HUD lead hazard control grant portion of this report, some of the deteriorated surfaces identified did not actually contain lead paint and therefore were not lead paint hazards. The condition of each unit is unique and should be evaluated individually. Many of the painted surfaces noted to have deteriorated paint were components exposed to extreme weather conditions such as exterior window components, siding and trim. To determine if the deteriorated paint present constituted a lead hazard, a HUD Lead Assessment was conducted. Only EPA certified Lead Paint Professionals can perform both a lead inspection and a risk assessment. The risk assessment will only address the lead hazards present and will not address the correction of other deteriorated surfaces that are not leaded.

The visual assessment alone, if conducted by personnel with comprehensive visual assessment training can be very effective. One advantage of performing a visual assessment is the cost savings since non-certified EPA professionals can conduct visual assessments. In creating any new program that involves screening large

numbers of properties for lead hazards, the costs and benefits of using a risk assessment/lead inspection versus visual assessment must be carefully considered.

In this pilot project, 30 (27%) out of 113 property owners agreed to the performance of a lead hazard assessment on a voluntary basis. On the one hand, this could be viewed as evidence of a lack of interest or concern on the part of the property owners. Since there has been so much publicity about local lead hazards and the liabilities for property owners, it is hard to understand why a property owner would not want to take advantage of a free assessment with no regulatory consequences.

On the other hand, the fact that 27% went ahead with the voluntary assessment could be viewed very positively and as an opportunity on which to build with other property owners. The findings of this pilot suggest that a sizable number of property owners will cooperate with new programs that require them to assess and address deteriorated paint in properties that they rent to DHS clients.

Similarly, the fact that 9(30%) of the 30 units, in which lead hazards were documented in the HUD lead assessment, ultimately participated in the HUD grant program can be viewed in several ways. Skeptics might wonder why all of the property owner faced with the finding of a health hazard in their property would not have requested a $3,500 grant.

However, a more optimistic interpretation would be that the grant program was moderately well received and met a community need. Under this interpretation, it may be anticipated that the continuation of such a grant program would facilitate the implementation of a broader childhood lead poisoning prevention program requiring lead hazard reduction prior to the rental of a property to a public assistance client in Rochester.

7. SUMMARY

All 30 units (100%) assessed for this pilot project had deteriorated paint, which is very typical of pre -1978 painted surfaces. Eighty-three percent (83%) of these units were rated to be in excellent structural condition and 60% were rated to have a low overall amount of deteriorated paint.

The results of each of the 30 assessments, along with a cover letter explaining the findings were provided to the property owners, tenants and the DHS. In addition, the property owner was provided with a schedule of Free *Lead Safe Work Practices* training sponsored by Monroe County. Owners were encouraged to attend and utilize lead safe work practices when disturbing all pre-1978 paint.

Property owners were also encouraged to apply for Monroe County's $3500 HUD Lead Hazard Control grant. The owners of a total of 9 (30%) of the 30 units applied for the HUD grant. All 9 units were awarded a HUD grant and have completed lead hazard reduction work including clearance testing.

The lead hazard assessments for the HUD grant found that not all surfaces that were visually noted to be deteriorated actually contained lead paint. Each of the 21 property owners who did not apply for the County HUD grant were subsequently contacted and provided with a current schedule for Monroe County sponsored free *Lead Safe Work Practices* training. Each owner was also provided information on the City of Rochester's HUD lead grants.

The findings within this report will be utilized by Monroe County officials in the incorporation of lead hazard assessment into the QHI in the future.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Monroe County should work with the City of Rochester and all community partners to plan to incorporate an assessment of risk for lead poisoning into the QHI after the Rochester City Council amends the city property code to make peeling paint a health and safety hazard.
2. Monroe County should work with the City of Rochester and all community partners to consider implementation of the future City of Rochester Lead Code into QHI process.
3. Monroe County should work with the City of Rochester and all community partners to assure that some form of small grant funding program is continuously available to property owners to assist them in reducing the hazards identified.